

Applicant : Addis  
Appl. No. : 09/976,796  
Filed : 10/12/2001  
Title : VENTED SUSCEPTOR

Grp./A.U. : 1765  
Examiner : Matthew Anderson

Docket No. : PA0457DGA01

#4  
4/15/03  
mw

April 14, 2003

Honorable Commissioner for Patents  
Washington DC 20231

Sir:

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant appreciates the examiner's thorough review of the present application. Claims 1-2, 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taguchi et al. in U.S. Patent No. 5,895,527. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In the detailed action, the Examiner points out Fig. 2 and column 5, lines 5-25, and states "a bowl shaped graphite rotation mold (i.e. commonly known in the art as a susceptor)..." After having connected the rotation mold to be a susceptor, the Examiner then asserts "Ventilation holes 41 are cut into the susceptor as shown including some that are spaced vertically." Applicant wishes to respectfully point out that the graphite rotation mold pointed out in Fig. 2 and a susceptor are not equivalent. Taguchi clearly indicates the purpose of the rotation mold as the preferred method of making a crucible. This is done by placing powdered quartz on the inner surface of the rotation mold, and


FAX RECEIVED  
APR 15 2003  
GROUP 1700

heat is applied until the powdered quartz is melted and vitrified. The evacuation holes in the rotation mold are used to remove atmospheric gas located within the "now melting inner layer of powdered quartz source material." See col. 5, lines 17-29. On the other hand, a susceptor is used to hold a crucible, and sits on a vertical shaft during crystal growth. See col. 1, lines 39-43 and 55-57. Taguchi clearly points out the difference between this rotation mold described in Fig. 2, and a susceptor, which is clearly labeled as 15 in Fig. 4. While Taguchi clearly shows use of the rotation mold and of the susceptor, Taguchi does not insinuate, suggest, or teach any interchangeability between the rotation mold and the susceptor. Neither does Taguchi insinuate, suggest, or teach a susceptor with ventilation holes provided. In fact, Taguchi does not even teach the use of a rotation mold during crystal growth, but rather that it is only implemented for fabrication of crucibles. Taguchi does, however, clearly teach the use of a susceptor to hold a crucible during crystal growth; in fact the susceptor holds crucible manufactured using the rotation mold (see column 6, lines 1-7). Since Taguchi clearly does not teach a susceptor with vent holes as claimed by the present application, Applicant asserts that Taguchi does not anticipate or suggest the present invention, and therefore rejection under 102(b) is improper.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) are overcome, and submits that Claims 1-5 of the present application are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued in due course. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned agent to address any remaining issues in order to expedite examination.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees are required. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500682.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas G. Anderson  
Registration No. 42,262

FAX RECEIVED  
APR 15 2003  
GROUP 1700